1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	
4	T. D. DITTIE 117 D. C. C. C. N. 1.C. 10444
5	<i>In Re</i> FLINT WATER CASES Case No. 16-10444
6	
7	/
8	DISCOVERY CONFERENCE
9	
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDITH E. LEVY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	APRIL 19, 2023
12	
13	APPEARANCES IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER:
14	James M. Campbell Campbell Conroy & O'Neil, P.C.
15	20 City Square, Suite 300 Boston, MA 02129
16	Melanie P Daly, I
17	Levy Konigsberg, LLP 605 Third Ave, Suite 33rd Floor New York, NY 10158
18	
19	Alaina N. Devine Campbell Conroy & O'Neil, P.C.
20	1 Constitution Wharf, Suite 310 Boston, MA 02129
21	(Appearances continued on next page)
22	
23	Jeseca C. Eddington, RDR, RMR, CRR, FCRR
24	Federal Official Court Reporter United States District Court
25	200 East Liberty Street - Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

1	Kristin Michele Dupre Campbell Conroy and O'Neil PC
2	1 Constitution Wharf, Suite 310 Boston, MA 02129
3	Philip A. Erickson
4	Plunkett & Cooney 325 E. Grand River Avenue, Suite 250
5	East Lansing, MI 48823
6	Patrick Lanciotti
7	Napoli Shkolnik PLLC 360 Lexington Avenue, 11th Floor
8	New York, NY 10017
9	Emmy L. Levens Cohen Milstein Sellers and Toll PLLC
10	1100 New York Avenue, NW Suite 500, West Tower
11	Washington, DC 20005
12	Michael A. Olsen Mayer Brown LLP
13	71 S. Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606
14	Corey M. Stern
15	Levy Konigsberg, LLP 605 Third Avenue, Suite 33rd Floor New York, NY 10158
16	
17	Mark R. Ter Molen Mayer Brown LLP
18	71 S. Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606
19	Michael L. Williams
20	United States Department of Justice Civil Division, Torts Branch,
21	Environmental Tort Litigation 175 N Street, N.E.
22	Washington, DC 20002
23	
24	To Obtain a Certified Transcript Contact: Jeseca C. Eddington, RDR, RMR, CRR, FCRR
25	Federal Official Court Reporter United States District Court
	200 East Liberty Street - Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

1	INDEX
2	<u>WITNESSES</u> <u>PAGE</u>
3	(None)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	<u>EXHIBITS</u>
9	(None)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	MISCELLANY
17	Proceedings4 Certificate29
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
ı	

PROCEEDINGS

2 THE CLERK: Calling the Flint Water Cases. 3 THE COURT: All right. Well, Jeseca already has your 4 appearances on the record. So we will dispense with that 5 formality. 6 And we have an agenda with six things. I'm hoping 7 number 5 and 6 were resolved, but I didn't get word that they 8 were. So perhaps we'll need to go over those. 9 But the first one is the individual plaintiffs' 10 request to address an issue related to a deposition of a 11 nonparty, Jennifer Vlach. 12 So would that be you, Mr. Stern? 13 MR. STERN: Yes, Your Honor. Corey Stern for the 14 plaintiff. Good morning or good afternoon. 15 This started out with a deposition of Jennifer Kaufmann. You may recall, Your Honor, that there was 16 17 some briefing and Veolia had opposed the deposition. And when 18 we went to take the deposition, it turned out that after all of that briefing, after all of that back and forth, that 19 20 witness knew nothing about the Twitter account, knew nothing 21 about the advertisement campaign, and no one ever let us know 22 that. 23 And so she had mentioned a name of another Jennifer 24 from the same company. Jennifer Vlach --25 (Technical difficulties)

```
1
               THE COURT:
                          Did Mr. Stern freeze for anybody else?
 2
               MR. OLSEN:
                          He did.
 3
               THE COURT: Let's -- Ms. Daly, can you text him and
      let him know?
 4
 5
               MS. DALY:
                          Yes, Your Honor. I was just about to do
 6
      that.
 7
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
               MS. DALY: Let him know he's frozen.
 8
 9
               MR. STERN: Can y'all hear me?
10
               MS. DALY: Oh, there we go.
11
               THE COURT:
                          Now we can.
12
               MR. STERN:
                          Sorry. I don't know where I left off,
13
      but I've since been --
               THE COURT: Yeah. We last heard that there had been
14
15
      some -- that you took Jennifer Kaufmann's deposition.
16
      knew nothing about the Twitter account issue. And that's all
17
      we know.
18
                          And so she had mentioned the name of
               MR. STERN:
19
      another Jennifer who worked for the same company at the same
20
      time. And we sent a subpoena for her deposition.
21
               I had asked the Veolia attorneys to confirm that this
22
      was the right person so that I didn't spend or none of us
23
      spent any time as we did on the Kaufmann deposition going down
24
      a rabbit hole of somebody who had no knowledge.
               And since that time, I've been contacted by a private
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
attorney for her who we were supposed to speak at noon today
eastern time, but I did not hear from him. And I think at
this point it doesn't need to be addressed I guess by the
Court right now because I'm going to wait to see what the
private lawyer has to say about her knowledge. But just
trying --
         MR. OLSEN: Your Honor, I think I can tell Mr. Stern
what I think he's going to say, because we made the same
inquiry that he did. And just by --
         THE COURT:
                    Okay. Just a minute. Then this is the
part where I'll say, "Okay. Please do that."
         MR. OLSEN:
                    Okay. I -- and just to back up a little
bit, we did have a hearing on Ms. Kaufmann where I said on the
record that we didn't think Ms. Kaufmann had anything to do
with the PR issues. So I don't know why there was confusion
about that.
         But I'll say the same thing about this woman.
I don't know this woman. But we also had a discussion with
the attorney that she has hired. And we've been informed that
she did some work with respect to the Suez merger and VNA's
Suez merger, but she did not have any involvement with Flint
or any of the issues related to Flint or PR related to Flint.
         So I think we're going to end up in the same place
with Ms. Vlach and her lawyer can have that conversation with
```

Mr. Stern. But that's what we know, so I suspect that's what

he's going to tell Mr. Stern as well.

```
2
               THE COURT: Do you know who does have the information
 3
      regarding --
 4
               MR. OLSEN: So good question, Your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT:
                          Just a minute.
 6
               MR. OLSEN:
                           Sorry.
 7
               THE COURT:
                          Count to 3. After I stop speaking, count
 8
      silently to 3 and then you start speaking. That will be maybe
 9
      just a way of handling this.
               So what we're looking at is -- what I understand Mr.
10
11
      Stern to be concerned about is looking further into the what's
12
      been called the dynamic search advertising feature, or
      whatever it is that VNA was using, that he is concerned was
13
      reaching jurors in Bellwether I and could reach jurors in
14
15
      another -- either in our upcoming class case or a future
16
      bellwether trial.
17
               And so do you know who would know what was -- what
18
      the nature of that advertising was at one of these companies?
19
               MR. OLSEN: So two things. With respect to this
20
      person that we've been talking about, the two Jennifers, that
21
      came from Mr. Connor's deposition where he said he wasn't sure
22
      about who this person was, didn't remember a name.
23
      quessed at Jennifer. So I don't know that there is such a
      Jennifer.
24
25
               But with respect to the question of the dynamic ads,
```

that issue came up after the geotargeting issue was put to bed and we've produced documents, analytical data, other information.

We even produced to Mr. Stern a declaration from an expert in Google ads and social media who analyzed all of that data and all of those documents and concluded that none of the dynamic ads or the advertising were targeted in any way to jurors or perspective jurors. And we've provided the advertising analytical data by zip code and other information to demonstrate exactly that.

But I don't know who this person Mr. Connor referred to in his deposition. If there is a person, I don't know who that is.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, it sounds like for now Mr. Stern is going to speak with Jennifer number 2's lawyer and try to find out what she knows, if anything. And then he'll go from there.

MR. STERN: Your Honor, that's true. But since
Mr. Olsen just made that very thorough statement, I think a
good question then to ask -- and I wasn't planning on even
arguing anything about this today. I was just giving the
background about why the judge didn't -- why the Court didn't
need to address it.

But since Mr. Olsen just said all that, we know that Actum is a company that engaged with Veolia and that someone

from Actum told someone from VNA when responding about the Twitter account, quote, "That was us," quote.

And so maybe Mr. Olsen and his client could at least tell us who at Actum played a role on behalf of VNA as part of the VNA Flint facts Twitter handle. Because someone at Veolia knows who at Actum they were engaged with on this issue, whether her name was Jennifer or Corey or Michael or whatever. And so maybe that's the best question.

And there's no way that no one at Veolia knows who at Actum was part of the account that dealt with Flint during the Bellwether I trial.

THE COURT: Well, here's what we'll do. I'll ask

Mr. Olsen to have a conversation with you following this

hearing so that we don't all go through this process with the

two of you.

But Mr. Olsen, please, and Mr. Stern please discuss that. Because if there is somebody at this company called Actum that Veolia is aware of, that would be the fastest way to make progress on this issue.

So the second issue on the agenda is another one that I think Mr. Stern submitted. And it is regarding various amended requests for production of documents that was issued to VNA and requests for admission and Veolia's responses.

In Re Flint Water Cases - Case No. 16-10444

So tell me more about that, please.

MR. STERN: So we've met and conferred about this on

numerous occasions. And at the moment, I don't believe there's anything for Your Honor to become involved with.

I do and I've told Veolia that we intended to at least flag for Your Honor. There is one issue that we anticipate is going to be a part of this going forward.

And at some point Your Honor made the determination that documents and information kept in the possession of the Veolia entity's post January 2017 had no relevance to this case and discover was limited to pre 2017 information.

We believe at this point that that date range not just for the public relations part of this, but even for Veolia's activities associated with what they did between 2015 and 2016, do have relevance.

We intend to seek documents. And I don't want to get into why, but there was testimony at trial at least -- I'll give you a little background -- that at one point Veolia went into crisis mode. And there was testimony from at least one Veolia employee that they did utilize either internal chat or text messages.

You'll recall from trial that one of the large issues was the LeeAnne Walters' residence and how nobody told Veolia anything. And there very well may be communications post January 2017 as part of that crisis management that discusses what people knew or didn't know about LeeAnne Walters even though it's not within the time period that Your Honor deemed

```
to be relevant for purposes of discovery back in 2016 when
 2
      this issue first came up.
 3
               I think Veolia would like the opportunity, if this
 4
      does come up, to submit a one- or two-page letter brief. And
 5
      obviously they should have every opportunity to present their
 6
      position on this as we would want every opportunity to present
 7
      ours.
 8
               But in -- as part of this issue about the ongoing
 9
      discovery, the first amended, second amended, third amended,
10
      fourth amended, and the second request for admissions, that is
11
      going to be an issue irrespective of what is produced.
12
               And I just wanted to flag that for Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
14
               Now there's an issue with VNA's privilege log.
15
               MR. STERN: We've not resolved it, but we have agreed
      to not argue it today because there will be more information
16
17
      provided from Veolia to the plaintiffs next week.
18
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                  Thank you.
19
               And now there is the issue of the proposed protective
20
      order regarding Dr. Specht's MATLAB code. And I received the
21
      very short briefing or whatever we're going to call it on this
22
      as well as the joint proposal for a protective order.
23
               Is there anything further from plaintiffs that you
24
      would like to provide, Mr. Stern?
25
               MR. STERN: No, Your Honor.
```

Anything further, Mr. Olsen? 1 THE COURT: 2 The only thing I would add, Your Honor, MR. OLSEN: 3 is as you're aware, we agreed to a very robust protective 4 order. 5 The only two issues we have issue with is the wildly 6 exorbitant liquidated damages provision. We looked far and 7 wide and found no precedent for such a thing. 8 We found a case, Sony Computer, talking about and 9 rejecting a smaller \$50,000 liquidated damages provision 10 saying there's scant or no support for that. 11 We think imposing a liquidated damages provision on 12 jointly and severally against VNA and all active counsel of 13 record is ridiculous and unnecessary. If there is -- there's never been a violation of the 14 15 protective order to date by VNA or anybody associated with And if that ever happened, the Court is well within its 16 17 power and ability to take appropriate action in imposing a 18 liquidated damage provision is unnecessary and as framed we 19 think ridiculous. 20 The only other issue we took was a declaration in 21 there or adding language declaring the code proprietary. We 22 have no problem if the protective order says that Dr. Specht 23 or plaintiffs believe it's proprietary. But we haven't even 24 seen the code. And so we just didn't want to agree that this 25 is proprietary.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me say the following. 1 2 I'm starting with the issue of VNA's challenge to the 3 use of the word proprietary and confidential. I've already made a decision on that in past orders related to this 4 5 And I have described the code as proprietary and 6 confidential and that wasn't challenged by VNA at the time. 7 I went back to Black's Law Dictionary to make sure I 8 understood what proprietary meant. And according to Black's 9 dictionary, it simply means holding as property. And when you look back at what Dr. Specht has described with respect to 10 11 this code in his own declarations and so on, is he has 12 described it as proprietary. And it's clearly confidential. 13 That's why we have this issue in the first place. But he -- Dr. Specht himself stated that he has a --14 15 "I hold the copyright over it as well because I developed this 16 MATLAB code." So that sort of indicates that he -- that it's 17 proprietary. 18 And VNA, in your own briefing, you've indicated that the Dr. Specht's device does not, quote, "spit out a bone lead 19 20 reading" but rather, quote, "he developed his own algorithms 21 and formulas to take the data generated by his device, filter 22 out other factors, and calculate a lead measurement. So it seems that you've acknowledged that this is his 23 24 product that your expert couldn't repeat without getting his 25 code. And so that's the whole dispute.

```
So I have no problem with referring to it as
 2
      proprietary and confidential. So that language will stay in.
 3
               The next issue, as I see it in here, is that it looks
 4
      as if -- but maybe you're not concerned about this now -- on
 5
      page 2 1B, that you did not want to insert the names of VNA
 6
      counsel who will be signing the attachment here, that they
 7
      will live -- counsel and/or expert. You didn't want to insert
 8
      the name in addition to Dr. Huber of those lawyers.
 9
               And tell me why that is.
10
               MR. OLSEN: No, Your Honor. We have no problem with
11
             We just said once we agree to a protective order and
      know what it is, we'll provide the names.
12
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Good.
               MR. OLSEN: And you're right it's going to be
14
15
      Dr. Huber and a handful of lawyers working on the Specht
16
      issue.
                           Okay. That's resolved. So then we get
17
               THE COURT:
18
      to this issue of liquidated damages which I see was to --
19
      plaintiffs are seeking $40 million for either an intentional
20
      or unintentional violation. Or 50 percent of the fees paid to
      VNA since January 1, 2016, related to the Flint Water Crisis.
21
22
               That was a creative sort of effort there. And what
23
      I'll do here is take out the words "intentional and
24
      unintentional". And it will just say a violation of this
25
      order may subject each attorney with -- those who have signed
```

```
the -- what's it called, Exhibit A, or anyone who violates it
 1
 2
      -- you're going to figure out this language. But it may
 3
      subject them to a fine to be determined by the Court.
 4
               So I just would need to tether the number to the
 5
     damage that's caused and to hear more about it at that time.
 6
               MR. OLSEN:
                          Okay, Your Honor. We will draft it
 7
     accordingly.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. So that will be the
 9
     solution there. Okay.
                              Now --
10
               MR. STERN:
                          Your Honor?
11
               THE COURT:
                          Yes.
12
               MR. STERN: May I just ask one question.
13
               THE COURT:
                          Sure.
               MR. STERN: Not about the part that you just
14
15
      referenced. But about the insertion of names part, which
16
     Mr. Olsen said now there's no issue with. I assume that those
17
     names will be provided before the entry of the protective
18
     order.
19
               Because we've met and conferred about this on
20
     numerous occasions with Mr. Ter Molen. We've never met and
21
      conferred about it with Mr. Olsen. And this is the first time
22
      that anyone has said there's no issue with this. And it's
23
      important to Dr. Specht to know who the individuals are that
24
     are subject to this protective order prior to its entry.
25
               So I just want to be clear that that will -- I want
```

to make sure that it's the Court's desire for that to happen

```
2
      prior to entry.
 3
               MR. OLSEN: Yes is the answer. We will provide them
 4
      prior to entry --
 5
                          Well, he was actually addressing
               THE COURT:
 6
      myself about --
 7
               MR. OLSEN:
                           Okay.
 8
               THE COURT: -- whether I wanted to see that. And I
 9
      do because I -- it's to be -- it is so ordered at the bottom.
10
      So I'll need it to be filled out, just as Mr. Olsen seemed to
11
      be suggesting.
12
               Is that your understanding, Mr. Olsen?
               MR. OLSEN: Yes. And I think we said that to Mr.
13
14
      Stern's colleague. But yes is the answer. We will provide
15
      the names to go into the protective order.
16
                          Okay. Okay. So now, Mr. Olsen, you have
               THE COURT:
17
      a request to discuss Bellwether II, the pool of 40 potential
18
      plaintiffs and their discovery responses, and the pool
      reduction schedule.
19
20
               MR. OLSEN: I think we can take this off today's
21
      agenda, Your Honor.
22
               We have met and conferred with plaintiffs' counsel.
23
      They've agreed there needs to be some supplemental discovery.
24
      We are going to agree to amend the schedule for further
25
      narrowing the pool until we get that discovery. And we're
```

```
1
      meeting and conferring to have that amendment to provide to
 2
      Your Honor.
 3
               So assuming you don't have any objection to us so
      amending the schedule, we can take this off calendar for today
 4
 5
      and hopefully work it out.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. I don't have any problem with
 7
      that. Thank you.
 8
               And now there's VNA's request to discuss class
 9
      plaintiffs use of experts from the class certification stage
      for the issues class trial I assume.
10
11
               MR. OLSEN: Yes, Your Honor.
12
               And I'm not sure if this is resolved or not.
13
      only reason we're raising this is there were a number of
14
               Ducatman, Gamble, Gardoni, Goovaerts, Keating,
15
      Lanphear, and Pogorilich who --
16
               THE COURT: Can you spell the last one?
17
               MR. OLSEN: P-o-g-o-r-i-l-i-c-h.
18
               Who are used in connection with class certification
19
      but not resubmitted for the trial. And so we just were
20
      looking for confirmation that they weren't going to be used at
      trial so we didn't have to file Daubert motions with respect
21
22
      to any of them.
23
               Class plaintiffs' counsel got back to us saying that
24
      with a possible exception of Gardoni, they did not think that
```

they would call and had no plan to call those witnesses at

trial but would let us know in advance of the Daubert date if that changed.

And since the Daubert date is May 12, we're just quickly approaching that. And we certainly would prefer not to address any of this if we don't need to.

So we're just trying to get some confirmation that that is the case and these experts are off the table. We don't have to file those motions.

THE COURT: Well, there's a couple of reasons you don't have to file those motions. But I -- someone can respond in just a minute.

But I want to talk about the Daubert motion practice in general. I would urge you, Mr. Olsen, in the strongest possible terms to read the case law on Daubert motions.

And in our last trial, VNA challenged each and every one of plaintiffs' expert on all of the Daubert prongs.

You're not qualified. This isn't science. You know, the whole thing. It's not scientific. And it wasn't successful.

There were one or two very small portions of expert reports that -- where I agreed with your motion. But not that the person wasn't qualified to testify. Just that they had not provided an explanation for how they reached one or two narrow parts of their conclusions.

So it's not helpful to me. It's not helpful to your client to put these -- throw these motions in here thinking,

```
oh, I know I'll preserve the record on appeal. Certainly it
 2
      will be there on appeal that you've said all of this.
 3
      you read the case law, it's not going to help your appeal.
 4
               So I just would urge you for the sake of all of us --
 5
      but I'm thinking of myself most right now -- that -- and I'm
 6
      sure this will have no impact so maybe I'll just stop right
 7
      there.
 8
               So it's a lot of work. What happens with these
 9
      motions is there has to be a response. Of course you file a
10
            And then over here at the court, we have to do a lot
11
      of work that would otherwise we would just hear this testimony
12
      and along with the jury and I would be ruling on objections at
      that time.
13
14
               But I just urge you to think about that.
15
               But is there a response from class plaintiffs'
      counsel regarding whether Mr. Olsen's understanding of who
16
17
      you're using from the certification stage is correct?
18
               MR. OLSEN:
                          Ted, you're on mute.
19
               MR. STERN:
                          Ted, you're on mute.
20
               MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you. I'm sorry.
21
               Good afternoon, Your Honor. Ted Leopold, class
22
      counsel, to address this issue.
23
               Generally, Your Honor, we have tried to make it as
24
      easy as we can. And we have informed VNA's counsel that in
```

all likelihood, we will not be using six of these or seven or

so of these experts.

However, just along the lines of what you've just been saying, Your Honor, we're so far away from trial that it's a little bit hard with a lot of various issues still pending as Your Honor knows. Summary judgment issues, the third party defendant issues that is going to have a strong indication on where or time-wise and witnesses that may or may not be needed.

So all we ask for at this point in time we don't intend to be using those experts.

However, as we move forward towards trial and of course with sufficient amount of time so no one would be prejudiced, clearly not VNA nor the Court, that if things change based upon some rulings of the Court and some other issues, that with appropriate timeliness, we would inform VNA that one or more of these experts may be used and we can address that issue at that time so that we don't take up the Court's time and everybody else's commitments on replying to these what in all likelihood may be irrelevant Daubert motions.

THE COURT: Here's -- thank you, Mr. Leopold.

Your indication that we're so far from the beginning of trial is not -- I guess if you count seconds and nanoseconds between now and October 3, there's a good number of days in there.

But I do want to let you know that following this hearing, I have asked Leslie Calhoun, my law clerk, to send the schedule. I have filled in dates. I have also changed a couple of the dates that have been agreed upon because I absolutely have to build in an opportunity to decide the many motions that will be forthcoming.

It's all good and well for everybody to brief these issues. But somebody has to read all of this briefing and entertain further argument and decide each of the motions.

So when Leslie sends that to all you this afternoon -- and I've asked her to send it to bellwether counsel or individual counsel as well, just so everybody sort of knows what we're looking at -- I want you to pay very close attention to the fact that I am indicating in this new schedule that there will be no stipulation. I will not entertain motions for extension of time.

Just we'll never get to the finish line if I do.

I also won't entertain motions for extensions of page limits that are otherwise set by the Eastern District of Michigan local rules. Because otherwise, I won't be able to get through reading all of your motions.

What I'll have to do is stop. I'll just stop at page 25 if it's a dispositive motion. I'll just stop reading. So you might be submitting a lot more pages, but I just will not be able to read them. So I think you should have all your

arguments in the pages that I'll read.

So I just draw that to your attention because I've written that in this new schedule.

So what will happen is she's going to email that to you so you can take a close look at it. And we will have a discussion of it later in the month so that we all know what we're doing here and we can each do our part responsibly and carefully.

So is there anything else today?

MR. OLSEN: Your Honor, just to follow-up on that. I don't remember if it was Mr. Leopold or his colleague who had suggested they would let us know well in advance of that May 12 Daubert deadline. So I hope we can get an answer on those experts in the next week or two. And so just so we don't have to --

THE COURT: The problem is -- I mean, I hear what Mr. Leopold is saying, which is that the briefing on the nonparty at fault issue is not going to be done in time for a decision to be made prior to May 12.

So Mr. Leopold, I would just be overly cautious in letting VNA know who you think you're going to use.

MR. LEOPOLD: And I appreciate that, Your Honor. And we've done the best that we can at this point I guess the best thing that we can do is at this point these individuals, again depending on what happens between now and the May timeframe

when the Dauberts are due, we may know more and we can say definitively that A, B, or C will be.

But at this point in time, we don't anticipate. And if we have to, of course, seek leave of court, I just want the record to be clear that, you know, depending on what happens in the near future, we may have to amend that and tell VNA we need to add one or two people based upon what perhaps the Court may rule or some other issues.

And we've -- that's about as best as we can do at this point because we just don't have the full picture of where we're going to be in maybe four to six weeks.

THE COURT: Let me tell you this, I found your motion to strike regarding the nonparty at fault or motion for judgment as a matter of law. I forget what you called it. I found it very interesting. I'm looking forward to reading the response. But I can't say right now what the decision will be.

So I think you should work on the assumption that as of today, the nonparty at fault issue is in there. I found it interesting. I found it to be compelling and thoughtful what you submitted.

MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you.

THE COURT: But I haven't seen the response. So that's how this process works. Something comes in, I think, oh, so.

What? 1 2 MR. LEOPOLD: And Your Honor, just to be crystal 3 clear, not all of these experts that we potentially will not 4 be calling address specifically third party related issues. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 They're just a variety, as Your Honor MR. LEOPOLD: 7 is aware, a number of different issues that since -- and I 8 realize we're not far from trial. But in terms of actually 9 figuring out who, what, and when are going to testify and what issues, we just have some open ended issues over the next 10 11 several weeks that, depending on what may happen, can create a 12 potential where we may need to come back to the Court and say 13 this one individual may need to be added. And we, of course, will work with VNA to do whatever 14 15 they want to do about those issues. I'm not saying that's 16 going to happen. We just don't want to be prejudiced by 17 saying today these seven people are not going to testify so 18 far ahead of trial. 19 THE COURT: Okay. But soon you'll have to say 20 because there's a May 12 cutoff that's not going the move, so. 21 MR. LEOPOLD: Okay. 22

MR. OLSEN: And maybe, Your Honor, maybe we can skin this cat, as Mr. Leopold suggested, if there is one or two of these seven experts that they have a different view on they'll seek leave of court to add them, maybe we can -- this is

23

24

entirely up to you obviously, Your Honor.

But maybe we can reserve then if they add one or two of these experts, maybe we then address that with a Daubert motion or something so we don't have to file six or seven motions now as opposed to later.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's just see how this issue develops.

MR. LEOPOLD: That's what we're trying to, I think both Mike and myself, are trying to accomplish for Your Honor is to. In all likelihood, Judge, we're not going to be calling these people. So we don't want to say, yes, we're going to call them and then have all this extra paperwork only to be not prejudiced down the road.

So I think if the parties can work together -- and it seems like VNA's counsel and us can do that. Again, I don't think it's going to be more than if it is even anybody else, one or two people.

We just don't want to burden the Court as opposed to saying since we don't know what we're going to do right now, here's all six. We're going to have them all testify and we burden the Court with all the paper and things of that sort. We're just trying to prevent that.

THE COURT: And to be clear, I've read the Daubert motions on most of the names I think you identified,

Mr. Olsen. Because you already filed Daubert motions with the

```
class certification motion even though I didn't decide most of
 2
      them at that time, so.
 3
               MR. OLSEN: And it was a different standard applied
 4
      at that time for class cert.
 5
               THE COURT:
                          It was, yep. Okey dokey.
 6
               MR. STERN:
                          Your Honor?
 7
               THE COURT:
                          Yes.
 8
               MR. STERN: Sorry. This is Corey Stern. I just
 9
      wanted to apologize to the Court and to VNA. I did get an
10
      email on Monday from Mr. Ter Molen on that issue of the names
11
      of attorneys wherein he said we will provide specific names as
12
      appropriate once the Court has resolved the open issues. And
13
      I was wrong when I said that this is the first I've heard
      that. Because it was in an email from Mr. Ter Molen. And I
14
15
      would be remiss if I didn't just admit that. And so I
16
      apologize for misstating that.
17
               I didn't misspeak because that's what I thought.
18
      I got it wrong.
                      And that's on me.
19
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. Thank you. All right. Thank you,
20
      all.
21
               MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor?
22
               THE COURT: Yes.
23
               MR. CAMPBELL:
                              This is James Campbell, Your Honor.
24
      just had one issue on the Bellwether II. And I just wanted to
25
      be clear.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Your Honor was kind enough to hear Mr. Olsen and Mr.
Lanciotti on the schedule. I just wanted to remind the Court
that our selections for the Bellwether II cases I think are
due next -- a week from Friday. So I just didn't want to have
-- you know, I think we're working together.
         We're going to agree to an extension if it's okay
with Your Honor. But given that that was an important date, I
just wanted you to know that it's right on us, that date, that
we would need more time for.
         THE COURT:
                    That's okay. Especially -- my
unwillingness to see extensions on dates relates right now to
the class trial. So that will work just fine.
        MR. CAMPBELL:
                        Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Yeah.
                            Thank you.
        MR. STERN: Your Honor, one last question.
         THE COURT:
                    Sure.
         MR. STERN: And if there is a change in the -- the
last time we met -- and I don't recall if it was a discovery
conference or if it was a full out status conference.
Your Honor commented or at least eluded to the fact that there
might be a change in the timing of the Bellwether III trial.
         I'm not pushing on that issue, but it's
understandable that at this point the Court is focused heavily
on the class trial and the deadlines. And I know there's been
```

some exchanges of time limits between the parties.

```
If, in fact, there's going to be a change to the
 2
     Bellwether III trial start date, you know, we have hotels
 3
     booked. We have those kind of things. Again not the Court's
 4
     main concern at this point. But as soon as anyone knows, if
 5
     we can be informed, that would be very helpful for vendors,
 6
      for scheduling purposes and those types of things.
 7
               THE COURT: Right. Mr. Stern, no, that is on my
 8
     mind. All of the above is on my mind. Both the details for
 9
     counsel in the class trial as well as those for Bellwether
10
          I think you can assume that we can't start that trial in
11
     mid-January. Because with the holiday, Thanksqiving,
12
     Christmas holiday, New Year's holiday, school holidays, I
13
     don't know how we would be able to start it in January.
               Partly because if we're going to use a jury
14
15
     questionnaire, I have to bring those 200 jurors in, swear them
16
      in to answer truthfully and accurately, and we'll be in the
17
     middle of the class trial and I can't spend all day swearing
18
      jurors in for several days in a row. So just it's going to
19
     have to be postponed.
               MR. STERN: Okay.
20
21
               THE COURT:
                          Good.
22
                          Thank you, Judge.
               MR. STERN:
                           All right. Well, thank you. And for
23
               THE COURT:
24
     Mr. Williams and Mr. Stern, I'm currently working on the
25
     motion related to the FTCA adult plaintiffs or claimants.
```

```
Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate
               MR. WILLIAMS:
 2
      that.
 3
               THE COURT: I'll get it to you as soon as I can.
 4
               MR. STERN:
                           Thank you.
 5
                           (Proceedings Concluded)
 6
 7
                   CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
 8
             I, Jeseca C. Eddington, Federal Official Court
 9
     Reporter, do hereby certify the foregoing 29 pages are a true
10
     and correct transcript of the above entitled proceedings.
11
      /s/ JESECA C. EDDINGTON
                                                            04/22/2023
      Jeseca C. Eddington, RDR, RMR, CRR, FCRR
                                                            Date
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```